

Appl. No.: 10/719,719

Response dated: October 23, 2007

Reply to Final Action of: August 9, 2007

#### Remarks and Argument

Independent claims 1 and 13 have been amended. Claims 2 - 12 remain as originally presented.

Applicant's representative gratefully acknowledges the thoughtful comments and assistance of the examiner.

Claims 1 - 13 have been rejected; however, the amended claims clearly include the limitation that both the portable computer and second card reader means be located outside of the facility served by the emergency ingress and egress system. These limitations are introduced following a telephone interview with the examiner on Wednesday, October 3, 2007. The claims as amended overcome grounds for objection identified and specifically cited by the examiner.

The specification clearly provides sufficient antecedent basis to support and fully justify the amendments.

The specification provides an irrefutable basis directly and by inference that the portable computer 4 is located outside of the facility served by the emergency ingress and egress system.

With respect to the portable computer 4, the specification, page 14, lines 1 - 4, clearly place the portable outside of the facility:

In the event of evacuation of the building, power failure, or similar emergency, the base computer 3 by wireless transmitter means 8 transmits 6 facility occupancy data to a portable computer located at a secure remote site.

Describing the secure site as "remote" places the portable computer out of the facility given the common definition of the term: far apart; far distant in space; far removed; or far off. (American College Dictionary, Random House, copyright 1967). By any standard, describing the location of the portable computer 4 as "remote" would be interpreted as the portable computer being located outside of the facility. Inclusion of "secure" modifying remote further and fully supports the above conclusion that more than adequate antecedent basis exists to claim the portable as located "outside of the facility."

The specification further provides an irrefutable basis that the second card readers means 5 are located outside of the facility. Considering the location of second card readers, the specification, page 14, lines 4 - 7 and page 15, lines 1 - 4 clearly place the second card reader means 5 outside of the

facility:

The portable computer 4 communicates, preferable by wireless means 7 with a plurality of second card reader means 5 located at designated emergency assembly areas. (page 14, 4 - 7).

Reference to designated assembly areas for emergency evacuation clearly suggests and justifies concluding an evacuation area located outside of the facility; a safe area. In addition according to the specification:

Employees evacuating the facility are directed to any of the emergency assembly areas at which employees indicate egress from the facility by passing their identification card through a second card reader means. (page 15, 1 - 4).

As described the employees are evacuating (leaving) the facilities and are directed to safe assembly areas where they indicate safe egress by use of the second card reader means 5. Clearly, the card reader means 5 are located outside of the facility at the emergency assembly areas.

The appended claims have been amended based on the foregoing to reflect the established fact that adequate antecedent basis exists in the specification to claim that the portable computer and the second card reader means are located outside of the evacuated facility.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the present claims are in condition for allowance and the application in condition to issue, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen R. Chapman, Reg. No. 45,468  
Attorney for the Applicant

Kindly address all correspondence to the above at:  
1220 Baypoint Drive  
Seneca, SC 29672